

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action mailed July 18, 2008, submitted concurrently with a one month extension of time to extend the due date for response to November 18, 2008.

By this Amendment, claims 1-11 have been amended to more particularly define the present invention and to put the claims in better form under U.S. practice. Thus, claims 1-11 are currently pending in this application. Support for the claim amendments can be readily found variously throughout the specification and the original claims.

In view of these amendments, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Specification

The specification is objected to for the informalities set forth in items 1-3 of the Office Action. Applicant has amended the specification to address each concern raised by the Examiner. Thus, in view of the amendments to the specification, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Claims

Claims 2, 5, 6 and 8-11 are objected to for informalities set forth in items 4-6 of the Office Action. Applicant believes that the above amendments to the claims overcome the outstanding objection by addressing each concern raised by the Examiner. Thus, in view of such amendments to the claims, withdrawal of the outstanding objection is respectfully requested.

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-7 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of copending Application No. 10/433,956 either alone or alternately in view of Yonezawa et al. (WO 02/046313). Applicant believes that the amendments to the claims render moot this rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant believes that the above amendments to the claims overcome the outstanding rejection by addressing the concern raised by the Examiner. Thus, in view of such amendments to the claims, withdrawal of the outstanding objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Yonezawa et al. (WO 02/046312) or Shibayama et al. (JP 2003/313345). Further, claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(f) for allegedly lacking inventorship. Applicant believes that the above amendments to the claims overcome the outstanding rejections since the claims are now directed to a process for a molded article which is shaped by molding.

An important feature of the present invention is that the shape by transfer of the shape of the die is highly maintained after curing, particularly not less than 75% of the shape provided by transfer before curing being maintained after curing. This important feature is obtained due to the specific thermosetting resin composition defined in claim 1 which enables the shape before curing to be highly maintained after curing.

Based on Applicant's review of Yonezawa et al. and Shibayama et al., both of the cited references do not teach or suggest such feature of the present invention (i.e. excellent shape retainability after curing). Hence, for this reason, Applicant believes that one skilled in the art cannot readily arrive at the present invention based on the teachings and suggestions of Yonezawa et al. and Shibayama et al.


Thus, withdrawal of the present rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are believed to be clearly patentable over the outstanding rejections. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the claims in light of the above remarks is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Dated: November 18, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By:  _____

Lee Cheng

Registration No.: 40,949
CHENG LAW GROUP PLLC
1100 17th Street, N.W.
Suite 503
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 530-1280
Attorneys for Applicant

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-4422 for any such fees; and applicant(s) hereby petition for any needed extension of time.